

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



DATE MAILED: 07/30/2002

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/902,056	07/09/2001	Rao Venkateswara Annapragada	VLSI-3402.DIV.1	9824
7:	590 07/30/2002		_	
CORPORATE PATENT COUNSEL PHILIPS ELECTRONICS NORTH AMERICA CORPORATION 580 WHITE PLAINS ROAD TARRYTOWN, NY 10591			EXAMINER	
			SARKAR, ASOK K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2829	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

·	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
· · · · ·	09/902,056				
Office Action Summary		ANNAPRAGADA, RAO VENKATESWARA			
·	Examiner	Art Unit			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	Asok K. Sarkar	2829			
Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) dwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the application to become ABANDON	timely filed ays will be considered timely. m the mailing date of this communication. IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09.	<u>luly 2001</u> .				
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ Th	is action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Disposition of Claims	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,	453 O.G. 213.			
4) Claim(s) 10-18 is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>10-18</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 09 July 2001 is/are: a) ☑ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
•					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.					
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.					
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) All b) Some * c) None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
 Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).					
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language pro 15)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti					
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3	5) Notice of Informa	rry (PTO-413) Paper No(s) I Patent Application (PTO-152)			



Art Unit: 2829

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 10 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gnade, US 5,561,318.

Gnade teaches a wafer comprising:

- a substrate 22 with reference to Fig. 1D; and
- a layer of porous nanoglass material (28 and 29) of silicon dioxide above the substrate 22 with reference to Fig. 1D, the porous material comprising:
- a first portion 28 having a baseline density (porosity 80%) associated with the porous material residing on top of the substrate 22 with reference to Fig. 1D;
- a second portion 29 having a density greater than the baseline density associated with the porous material (porosity 30%), the second portion 29 located above the first portion 28 with reference to Fig. 1D;
- a cap layer 30 of CVD derived oxide layer located above the porous material 29 with reference to Fig. 1D. All features of the figure are thoroughly described in between column 4, line 29 and column 5, line 32.

The greater density of second portion of the porous layer 29 compared to that of

Application/Control Number: 09/902,056

Art Unit: 2829

the first portion 28 of the baseline density is inherent because a material having lower porosity of 30% will have greater density than the same material having higher porosity of 80%.

The densification process of second portion of the porous layer by high density

Ar plasma in claims 14 and 15 is not given any weight because of the "Product by

Process" limitation.

Note that a "product by process" claim is directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made, *In re Hirao*, 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (footnote 3). See also *In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685; *In re Luck*, 177 USPQ 523; *In re Fessmann*, 180 USPQ 324; *In re Avery*, 186 USPQ 161; *In re Wertheim*, 191 USPQ 90 (209 USPQ 554 does not deal with this issue); *In re Marosi et al*, 218 USPQ 289; and particularly *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964, all of which make it clear that it is the patentability of the final product per se which must be determined in a "product by process" claim, and not the patentability of the process, and that an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in "product by process" claims or not. Note that applicant has the burden of proof in such cases, as the above case law makes clear.

Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Asok K. Sarkar whose telephone number is 703 308 2521. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8 AM- 5 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael J. Sherry can be reached on 703 308 1680. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 308 7722 for regular communications and 703 308 7722 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2829

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308 4918.

Asok K. Sarkar July 25, 2002

MICHAEL SHERRY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Mulayla 126/00